

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 16, 19-20, and 24-40 are pending in this case.

Applicants greatly appreciate the time that the Examiner spent discussing this case in a telephone interview on February 23, 2006. The telephone interview greatly helped to clarify that the cited art does not teach or suggest Applicants claimed invention, namely a mobile node attached to a *mobile gateway router* maintaining a binding update list while in a *home* network. The Applicants were pleased to note that the Examiner agreed that the prior art did not teach such limitations. As such, Applicants have amended independent Claim 16 to clarify that Applicants' claimed invention requires these limitations. Further, since such limitations are not taught by the cited art, Applicants feel that the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn. Applicants look forward to the early allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:**By: Indira Saladi

Motorola, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Section  
Law Department  
1303 E. Algonquin Road, Floor 3  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

Indira Saladi  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,759  
Telephone: 847-576-6735  
Fax No.: 847-576-0721  
[Indira.Saladi@motorola.com](mailto:Indira.Saladi@motorola.com)

6  
CM05034H